

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,908	09/23/2003	Carolus Matthias Anna Maria Mesters	TS1315 (US)	2519
23632 SHELL OIL CO	7590 01/24/200 OMPANY		EXAMINER	
P O BOX 2463			NGUYEN, TAM M	
HOUSTON, TX 772522463			ART UNIT .	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	
				W-17-1
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAÎL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		1)	_
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,908	ESTERS, CAROLUS MATHIAS	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 No</u>	ovember 2006.		
<u> </u>	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-35 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	n from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of the	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/23/03, 1/12/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/668,908

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0401788 in view of Sughrue (6,254,766).

The EP reference discloses an adsorbent composition comprising about 0.1-15 weight % of nickel oxide and a carrier comprising 50 weight % of zinc oxide and 50 weight % of alumina. The composition is prepared as claimed. It is estimated that the composition would have atomic ratio of Zn: Ni as claimed. See entire patent.

The EP reference; however, does not disclose that the nickel is in a reduced valance state.

Sughrue discloses an adsorbent composition comprising nickel, zinc, and alumina wherein nickel is in reduced state. See col. 2, lines 51-65.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the EP reference by treating the absorbent to produced an adsorbent having nickel in reduced valance state because Sughrue teaches that an adsorbent with nickel in reduced valence state would permit the removal of sulfur with minimal effect on the octane rating of the treated stream.

Election/Restrictions

The argument that the restriction is improper and the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden to the examiner is not persuasive. Applicant has not shown that the alternative use for the composition as proposed by the examiner is not feasible and because examining claims 27-35 along with the elected claims would place a burden on the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Tam M. Nguyen Examiner Art Unit 1764

> > Lam

TN